

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, June, 1886. .

METAPHOR AND POETRY.

In his second article, Prof. Hart twice accuses me of the "confusion of Rhetoric and Style." Let us see. We both think that Rhetoric is not specially connected with poetry. Prof. Hart, however, asserts that my analysis of poetical figures (which I call Style) is "a condensed treatise on Rhetoric" (!); and because it is Rhetoric, he rejects this part of my book. Now Rhetoric is "an art, not a science, for it neither observes, nor discovers, nor classifies; but it shows how to convey from one mind to another the results of observation," etc. (Prof. A. S. Hill.) I call it confusion to apply this term Rhetoric, the art of making prose, to a scientific process (observing and classifying poetical figures); I call it worse to found an argument on such a confusion; while to attribute the confusion, after profiting by it, to one's opponent—but let us look at Style. I use Style to cover the general field of tropes and figures in poetry: it is a technical, not a critical term. This distinction is all-important. "Style is the man" is impossible as a technical definition; it is like saying "Geology is the epic of creation." When we treat poetic imagination technically, we speak of various forms of the image or picture. We speak of Metaphor, of Personification, etc. We appeal to principles fixed and intelligible to all. The critical treatment appeals to a general and varying sense of beauty or fitness. A teacher is asked for a technical example of poetic imagination: he gives—"Christ's blood, the bath of sin" (G. Fletcher); and he neither approves nor condemns. But, secondly, he may give an example imaginative by the critical as well as by the technical standard: "In cradle of the rude, impetuous surge." Thirdly, he may leave the technical, and give the purely critical:

"Here are sands, ignoble things,
Dropt from the ruin'd sides of kings,"—

a literal statement, but filled with imagination; this we know by no technical rule, but by the critical sense. Such things cannot be reduced to standards and rules.—A good text-book

ought not to remain in the first stage, cannot reach the third: it belongs in the second, and the purely critical function must be left to the personal influence of the teacher.

Now let us come to our subject, and examine my critic's "far reaching suggestion" that I should "banish from the study of poetry all consideration of 'figures' and 'figurative language.'" *Pulvis et umbra sumus*; what is stable, what is sure? I had thought imagination and harmony were the basis of poetry; but Prof. Hart says it is a holy alliance of "metre and mood." I had thought that poetry addressed first of all the ear, offering relations of rhythm and melody; but that, with almost equal insistence, it appealed to the eye, offering the products of imagination. The poetic ear translates life into music; the poetic eye reports the facts of a concrete world in pictures. Technically, these pictures are "figurative language." This enables the poet to leave the literal statements and deductions of prose; he puts trust in his eye, and makes no discounts. "Le poète," says A. de Musset, *Oeuv. Posth.* 78, "n'a jamais songé que la terre tourne autour du soleil." That one phrase gives us the genesis of poetic figures. The poet's first office was to create language. Every word was once a poem—"Marry, how?—*Tropically*." "Alle Wörter sind...Tropen. 'Eigentliche Worte' d. h. Prosa giebt es in der Sprache nicht" (Gerber, *Die Sprache als Kunst*, I. 333). G. Curtius (ib. 336) says "dass die sprachbildende Geistes-kraft der poetischen Phantasie näher liege als der logischen Abstraction."—Then came poetry as distinguished from prose. Brinkmann (*Die Metaphern*, 8) quotes W. Humboldt, that the object of poetry is "das Wirkliche in ein Bild zu verwandeln." What have figures, asks Prof. Hart, "to do with the essence of poetry?" Aeschylus, with his ποντιῶν τε κυμάτων αγήριθμον γέλασμα; Shakspere, with "those eyes, the break of day, Lights that do mislead the morn;"—have they no answer? Splendid bursts of poetry exist which hardly betray a definite metre, and do not show a single figure; but it is absurd to conclude that metrical form and figurative expression are not essential to poetry as a whole.

"Das Wirkliche in ein Bild zu verwandeln."

Result of this process is the Metaphor in a wide sense,—Substitution, the trope (dealing with the meaning), as distinguished from the figure (dealing with the arrangement, as Antithesis). This general Metaphor, leaving aside minor forms like Synecdoche, has two divisions: 1) It expresses human life in terms of nature; 2) It expresses nature in terms of human life (Personification). Brinkmann has recently made a very useful distinction between Metaphor and Allegory, which latter Blair had defined, and others accepted, as a "continued Metaphor." It is rather a metaphor *figurative throughout*; whereas the ordinary metaphor *betrays the literal* and reveals itself as conscious trope: "*classi immittit habenas.*" To avoid confusion, it might be better to reject the name Allegory and speak of "perfect" or "imperfect" metaphors. Let us, then, call the metaphor foundation of poetical style. But here is a difficulty. From Aristotle down, the metaphor (substitution) has been defined as an "abridged comparison" (Blair); "*metaphora brevior est similitudo*" (Quint.); "*eine abgekürzte ("concentrirt") Vergleichung,*" etc. Cf. Brinkm. 25ff. If this be historically true, the simile, not the metaphor, is the foundation of poetical style. A solution of this difficulty was attempted in my "A.-S. Metaphor." The conclusions there reached were attacked by Hoffmann (Eng. Stud. VI. 163ff.) only so far as they affected A.-S. poetry and the theories of Prof. Heinzel. I now state those conclusions, slightly modified, again; and hope to find leisure some day for their defence on A.-S. ground.

Logically, "*metaphora brevior est similitudo*"; but not chronologically, not in process of development. No theory of these primitive processes can be entertained which bases them on formal logical inference. Order comes out of confusion, not confusion out of order. A child, even now, does not call a bird's nest a "house" on the basis of observed relations between a nest and a house: the nest *is* a house. There is no "like" about it, until the child (1) increases his vocabulary with the word "nest" and its meaning, and (2) brings the new word into relations with the old word ("house"). The imagination of primitive man was not analytic. He did not watch some ship ride the waves, and muse: "How like yon craft is to a fiery steed! I liken it to a fiery steed.

In fact, I shall save time by calling it a fiery steed." His restless eye, subject to no fine tutorings of reason, saw an actual horse bound over the "foaming fields" (not, in their turn, based on any expanse" of water—expanse of land"). This immediate vision is revived by true poets,—by Wolfram, say, in his dawn-figure: *Sine Kläwen durh die Wolken sint geslagen* (Lieder, II.). Wolfram *saw* the huge bird. Not by similes did men ever or anywhere build up that vast metaphor, Mythology.* Despite Dr. Hoffmann, too, I think A.-S. poetry bears out this theory of metaphors. How timid, how rare, the similes in the genuine heathen poetry! Its tropes are based on no constant relations. Everything (like the Latin adverb) is something else. One seems to look at things in a kaleidoscope: they are forever changing places. The most prominent figure is Variation. There is no space for similes, since the gap between literal and figurative, abstract and concrete, is so narrow that a metaphor leaps it almost unconsciously. There is no need for the simile-bridge.

I suggest, therefore, the following as a probable order of development in poetical style.—1. That form of metaphor now known as Allegory, entirely figurative, including, of course, Personification. 2. Metaphor proper, where the literal peeps through; as, in *classique immittit habenas.* 3. The metaphor grown entirely conscious of itself, conscious of the gap between reality and figure; divided into a) Implied Simile: "he *is* a lion"; and b) Stated Simile: he *is like* a lion.

FRANCIS B. GUMMERE.

New Bedford, Mass.

*It must be admitted that H. Spencer is against this application of the theory. He assumes (*Synthetic Phil., Eccles. Inst.* pp. 684, 692) the origin of animal names, etc. in mythology to be from persons through simile to metaphor, thence to outright identification. It seems to me more likely that original metaphor hardens into literal fact, just as words, which all admit to be original metaphors, become literal statement. The original mythological metaphor may be ascribed partly to the picturesque confusion of names, the "undeveloped language" which Spencer himself acknowledged to be powerful in the process (in fact, p. 685 may be set against p. 684), and partly to the vivid imagination of early man. Later and more curious souls, like Hamlet, institute elaborate comparisons between clouds and weasels.

**THE ACADEMIC STUDY OF
FAUST AGAIN.**

In a former contribution to the Notes, I commented briefly upon the results of an inquiry into the status of *Faust* as a subject of academic instruction in the United States, and accompanied this comment with an implied promise to report more fully on the subject at some future time. In addressing myself to the fulfillment of that promise, it has seemed to me that my report would be more readable and at the same time more useful to the teaching fraternity if, instead of giving a mass of dry statistics covering a hundred or more of our numberless American colleges and universities, I should simply describe the practice of, say a score of institutions, and do so in the exact words of my correspondents. For the selection made below, my personal caprice is responsible, and I would not for a moment dispute with any one who chose to contend that a better selection might have been made. I do presume, however, that what is here offered fairly represents the academic treatment of *Faust* in the country at large. It will be convenient to use the abbreviations I. for the First Part and II. for the Second Part of Goethe's *Faust* and that without committing ourselves at all to the critical heresy involved in the favorite French nomenclature: *le premier et le second Faust*.

Amherst; Prof. H. B. Richardson: "I have taught both I. and II. to my senior division during the Winter term for the past seven years. I have used Prof. Hart's edition of I., reading it entire, and a simple text of II., reading extracts from it amounting to half or two-thirds of the whole. This means sharp work for 13 weeks, 4 hours a week, . . . but I usually feel that the work is well done. I much wish there was a good edition of the whole poem with notes. I give a few lectures on *Faust* and place on the shelves of the reading-room whatever the library contains that will be of practical value to students To read I. and not II. is very undesirable."

Bowdoin; Prof. Henry Johnson: "I have never made but one attempt to teach II. and then the result was very discouraging. I should want a *very* helpful edition for the use of the class and a class of more maturity than I ever expect to see in a college, before I

should be tempted even to consider the question of trying it again. I. is not taught this year."

Brown; Prof. Alonzo Williams: "We read I. during the 2nd term of senior year, 16 weeks, 3 times a week. About a dozen lectures are given upon it also. We do not touch II."

Cincinnati; Prof. J. M. Hart: "*Faust* has never formed a regular part of our German course." Prof. Hart writes, however, that he has repeatedly given instruction in the entire poem, sometimes to a small class of volunteer students and again to individuals who had chosen *Faust* as the subject of a dissertation. He adds: "In my opinion I. without II. is no study."

Columbia; Prof. H. H. Boyesen: "We read I. entire with my commentary on *Goethe and Schiller*, and I myself read the greater part of II. in the class and translate it. Devote about six lectures during the year to comment upon II. The study of *Faust* runs through the entire collegiate year, 2 hours a week. Classes vary from 12 to 25."

Cornell; Prof. H. S. White: "We give *Faust* here as advanced optional work every other year. I have taken two or three classes through II., at one time lecturing and translating myself (9 weeks, 2 hours a week) and expecting students to be prepared on certain portions of the text and to present papers on certain topics, at another time treating the subject as seminary work and giving to II. 20 weeks, 2 hours a week. In my opinion, II. can be studied to great advantage with classical students only. I. is generally given 10 or 12 weeks, 2 hours a week. I give I. in lectures or readings with plentiful comments on text and poem, expecting class to be prepared on all but one or two scenes."

Dartmouth; Prof. J. H. Wright: "Since I have been connected with the college, the *Faust* has not been one of the works regularly read in our German course. I have read it, however, with one or two voluntary classes of seniors, but have done next to nothing with II."

Earlham; Prof. H. C. G. von Jagemann: "The second term of the second year in German, 12 weeks, 3 hours a week, is devoted to *Faust*. We read most of I. but there is no place in our curriculum for II."

Hamilton; Prof. H. C. G. Brandt: "From 1876 to 1882, at the Johns Hopkins University,

I read I. every year, Hart's edition. From 1883 till now I have also read II. in extracts. I give only two formal written lectures, but take up 6-8 hours with commentary and notes, particularly on II., so that students may get some idea of the whole work and of the unity of the same. German without *Faust* would be English without *Hamlet*."

Harvard; Prof. G. A. Bartlett: " *Faust* is studied here critically in a course on 'German Literature in the 18th century'. The critical study refers, however, only to I.; II. is treated only by lectures and not often in that way."

Johns Hopkins; Dr. Julius Goebel: "I shall read I. in my class from the beginning of March to the end of the year, 12 weeks, 2 hours a week. Besides, I devote a lecture to *Faust* in a course of 12 lectures on 'German literature in the 18th century.' II. will be treated only in my lectures."

Oberlin; Prof. J. K. Newton: "No instruction has ever been given in this college in either I. or II. Students have read I. more or less—usually less—but no satisfactory work has ever been done with it. This astounding statement will surely be sufficiently explained by the fact that at no time in the history of Oberlin College has more than 4 terms (a term=12 weeks, 5 hours a week) of German been offered to students."

Princeton; Prof. H. Huss: "Goethe's *Faust* hat bisher auf meinem Arbeitsfeld, dem Scientific Department, wegen der Ungunst der Verhältnisse noch keine Berücksichtigung gefunden, doch bin ich jetzt in den Stand gesetzt und entschlossen, das 2. Semester des Seniorjahres wöchentlich 2 Stunden demselben zu widmen. II. wird nur stellenweise übersetzt werden, sein Ideengehalt aber desto ausführlichere Behandlung in Vorlesungen erfahren."

Tufts; Prof. C. E. Fay: "*Faust* is not read in any of our courses. While I might see fit with a mature class to read I., I should not for a moment think of taking II. I think, considering the average age of American college students, that the time can be better employed in other reading."

Washington (St. Louis); Prof. J. K. Hosmer: "Our juniors read I. in the second term. They also hear lectures on German literature in German in which some attention is paid to *Faust*. No special attention is given to II."

Wesleyan; Prof. George Prentice: "I have several times read I. in my classes and shall do so this year. Have never given II. in the classroom but have twice assigned it to men as a part of their honor work."

Williams; Prof. R. A. Rice: "*Faust* I. and II. forms the work of the elective class in the 3rd year of German, covering a period of 20 weeks; lectures and recitations."

Wisconsin; Prof. W. H. Rosenstengel: "I. is read in the senior year, 3rd term, 2 hours a week. Only lectures are given on II. This year the following lectures were delivered: Geschichte der Faustsage (2); Goethe's *Faust* (2); Das didaktische Element des 2. Teiles des *Faust*; Scherer's Theorie in Bezug auf Goethe's *Faust*".

Yale; Prof. A. L. Ripley: "Since my connection with the German work here (2½ years), *Faust* has not been taken up. During the past 8 years, I. has been read at least twice to my knowledge, but I am sure that II. has never yet been read with a class. My plans for next year include the reading of at least I."

To the foregoing list, I will add the University of Michigan. I devote a year to *Faust*, 1 semester 2 hours a week to each part. For I., Hart's edition and Schröer's are both recommended; for II., Schröers. From I. only the Intermezzo is regularly omitted, from II. the Masquerade and the Walpurgis-night. In the study of II., members of the class present essays upon matters of interest in connection with the drama, some of these essays being simply synopses of the omitted portions of the text. Contrary to my former practice, I now give no formal lectures on *Faust* but work in all that I care to say about it apropos of passages in the text.

CALVIN THOMAS.

University of Michigan.

ZU DEN STRASSBURGER EIDEN.

—Salvarai eo cist meon fradre Karlo et in adiudha et in cadhuna cosa—

Die Interpretation dieser Stelle bietet Schwierigkeiten, auf die meines Wissens noch Niemand hingewiesen hat; auch Koschwitz nicht in seinem Commentar, der doch sonst so ausführlich ist, dass Vorlesungen über die ältesten Denkmäler wohl vorläufig von unseren Universitäten verschwinden werden. Um mit

Diez (Altroman. Sprachdenkmale, Seite 4) in den Worten "*et in adiudha et in cadhuna cosa*" eine nähere Bestimmung von *salvar* zu sehen, müssen wir mancherlei voraussetzen was *a priori* nicht selbstverständlich ist. Es giebt keinen rechten Sinn, wenn man einfach wörtlich übersetzt: "ich werde diesen meinen Bruder Karl unterstützen sowohl in Hilfe als in jeder Sache." Wenigstens ist der Ausdruck nicht *prae*cise genug für ein so wichtiges Denkmal. Erstens ist "*salvar in adiudha*" an sich unverständlich; und was bedeutet "*in cadhuna cosa*" im Verhältniss zu *adiudha*? Es kann sich in der *ad hoc* redigierten Eidesformel doch nur um Hilfe gegen Lothar handeln und um keine "Streitsache." Nehmen wir aber *cosa* einfach in dem üblichen Sinne = *chose*, wie soll denn Ludwig seinen Bruder anders unterstützen, als indem er ihm hilft? Um einen verständigen Sinn herauszubekommen, müssen wir "*adiudha*" einen engeren Begriff beilegen = "Hilfe im Kampfe." Diese Bedeutung hat nun zwar *aive* häufig im Altfranzösischen; das ist natürlich bei dem heroischen Character der afrz. Dichtung. Indessen *aive* hat diese Bedeutung doch durchaus nicht ausschliesslich, auch steckt dieselbe nicht etymologisch in dem Worte. Es dürfte daher nicht überflüssig sein, auf das *aiudha* des zweiten, von dem Heere geleisteten Eides hinzuweisen. Dort kann es sich natürlich um nichts anderes handeln, als um Heeresfolge. Ausserdem dürfte beachtenswerth sein, dass jenem zweiten "*in aiudha ier*" im deutschen Texte "ce follusti uurdhit" entspricht. In *follust* = *sol-leist* aber steckt auch etymologisch der Begriff der Heeresfolge (cf. got. *laistjan*; vgl. Kluge, Wb. s. v. *leisten*).

Wir sind also berechtigt, anzunehmen, dass auch an unserer Stelle *adiudha direct* = "Heeresfolge, Hilfe im Kampfe" ist, *et—et* muss heissen "so wohl—als auch überhaupt," und *cosa* in der Bedeutung des nfrz. *chose* kann dann gut dem *adiudha* co-ordinirt werden.

Wir interpretieren also: "ich werde diesen meinen Bruder Karl unterstützen sowohl in Bezug auf Heeresfolge (durch Hilfeleistung im Kampfe) als auch überhaupt in Bezug auf jede andere Sache (z. B. in Verhandlungen) = auf jede andere Weise.

Soviel zu Erklärung der Stelle, so wie sie überliefert ist.

Nun möchte ich die Gelegenheit benutzen,

um auf eine Emendation unserer Stelle hinzuweisen, welche Bonamy im Jahre 1751 vorschlagen hat (in den Mémoires de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles lettres, Bd. 26, 640-41). Die gewaltige ältere Literatur über die Eide ist durch die neuern scharfsinnigen Untersuchungen so in den Hintergrund gedrängt, dass man wohl nur noch gelegentlich einen Aufsatz durchblättert, der vor Raynouard fällt. So mag es kommen, dass Bonamy's Conjectur von Niemand mehr auch nur angeführt wird. Von älteren Herausgebern der Eide hat Grandidier sie acceptiert, (Histoire de l'église de Strasbourg 1778, II, 156 et pièces justificatives p. CCXVI; ich citiere dieses Werk nach Reiffenberg, Ph. Mouskes, II, iv, weil ich Grandidier selbst hier nicht zur Hand habe, sondern nur mangelhafte Notizen, die ich vor einem Jahre in Heidelberg genommen habe). Auch Roquefort (Gl. d. l. l. r. XX) giebt die Übersetzungen nach Bonamy. Dieser schreibt nämlich "*et in adiudha er in cadhuna cosa*," und begründet diese Conjectur (l. c. Seite 647) einfach: Les mots "*et in cadhuna cosa*" qu'on lit dans les sermens imprimés ne forment pas de sens, c'est pourquoi," etc.

Wenn nun das auch nicht völlig zutrifft, so ist die Ausdrucksweise mit *et—et* in der oben gewonnenen Bedeutung noch sehr insinuativ, bes. für einen Eid, der vor dem Heere geleistet wurde, und Bonamy's Conjectur scheint mir daher gründliche Überlegung wohl zu verdienen.

Es wären dann *salvarai* und *in adiudha er* ungetärr synonym, und die Stelle hiesse einfach: ich werde meinem Bruder hier helfen und beistehen in jeder Weise. Die Redensart "*estre en aiudha*" kommt auch im zweiten Eide vor, war also dem Redactor geläufig. Syntaktisch ist die Sache nicht unbedenklich. Man würde vor *er* ein *lui* erwarten; indessen kann ja *cist meon fradre* sowohl Accusativ zu "*salvarai*," als auch Dativ zu "*in adiudha er*" sein. Die ungebräuchliche Auslassung des Pronomens könnte gerade hier unter die anderen Anlehnungen an das latein. Original gezählt werden (cf. Diez, l. c. 4, und Koschwitz, Commentar, 6).

Bei dieser Lesart würde auch das Fehlen der entsprechenden Worte im deutschen Texte erklälicher werden. Lesen wir *et—et*, so ist die Stelle nach vorstehenden Erklärung nicht un-

wichtig für das Document, lesen wir aber *et-er*—, so ist sie nur eine ziemlich überflüssige Wiederholung und durfte daher in dem deutschen Texte unbeschadet des Sinnes ausbleiben.

Es fragt sich nun, sollen wir es wagen, an dem altehrwürdigen Texte eine Aenderung vorzunehmen? Dieselbe ist nicht gar gewaltsam. Wie sehr sich *r* und *t* häufig ähneln, weiss jeder Romanist (cf. auch Suchier, Jahrbuch f. rom. u. eng. Lit. XIII). Ein Irrthum konnte daher leicht jedem Abschreiber passieren, besonders einem Deutschen, der den frz. Text nicht mehr ganz verstand (cf. Koschwitz, I. c. 5). Diese Momente genügen allein schon, um die kleine Aenderung berechtigt erscheinen zu lassen. Dazu mag noch der Umstand kommen, dass mit *et in adiudha* eine Reihe im MS. zu Ende war, der Schreiber daher die ganze Phrase wahrscheinlich nicht in einem Zuge schrieb, sondern zwischenein auf seine Vorlage sah, so den Zusammenhang völlig verlor und sich vielleicht auch durch das ähnliche *et in-er in* — täuschen liess.—Obwohl also, wie wir oben sahen, auch der überlieferte Text sich ganz wohl übersetzen lässt, so möchte ich mich doch für Bonamy's Conjectur entscheiden.

GUSTAV KARSTEN.

University of Geneva, Switzerland.

ANGLO-SAXONICA.

¶

In the usual editions of our Anglo-Saxon works the MS. sign *þ* is printed in full *pæt*; in so-called critical editions, the expansion is at least indicated by italics, *pæt*. I am now satisfied that the only proper course, in all editions, is to retain the MS. sign, for the reason that it is not always — *pæt*.

When Wölker's *Beowulf nach der Handschrift* first came under my attention, it seemed to me that his sign *þ* must stand in some places for another word than *pæt*. But I was diverted from the investigation by more urgent matters. About two years ago, however, my eyes were opened very forcibly by the following passage in Leechd. III, 198. The title of the MS. runs in Latin: *De Somniorum diuersitate secundum ordinem abcdarii danielis prophetæ, in English: danielis þwitegan.* As if to make assur-

ance doubly sure, Cockayne has set in the margin: "So MS."

It was after this that I read the foot-note by Zupitza to his Beowulf-facsimile and transliteration, p. 2 (note to line 14 of the transcript): "*þ* generally means *pæt*, but sometimes, it would seem, *þa*; cf. Aelfric's Grammar 38, 3; 121, 4; 291, 2." Why did not Zupitza add a similar note to p. 37, line 4 (Beow. 766), to the effect that the MS. *sīð þ se hearm-scapa* might be read *sīð þone se*, etc.? cf. Sievers Beitr. IX, 138. The passage is corrupt (that is, the MS. is not clear throughout); possibly we may have to adopt still another reading: *sīððan*. But in any case *sīð þæt* cannot stand.

See also p. 47, line 3 (Beow. 990), where Sievers proposes to read *þe*; Beitr. IX, 139.

I can add several more examples from my own reading. See librum — *þ boc*, Luke iv, 20, Lind., where Rushw. has *ðio boc*.

See also *ð oper dei* Chron. (Earle) 1135 E. p. 260, 2; * *þ rihte weie* Chron. 656 E. p. 31, 12; *eall þ lented tid* 1127 E. 256, 37; *þ mynstre* 963 E. 123, 28 (mynster is masculine, feminine and neuter in later English, but in any case we can not look for a neut. acc. "*pæt mynstre*"). Granted that *þ* may be an approximation to our modern "the," in the above passages, it is all the more remote from "that."

Kluge, in his edition of Byrhtferths Handboc, Anglia VIII, 298—337, expands regularly *pæt*. Are we to read thus p. 309, 33: *fram þære easterlican tide þ heo est cume?* Is not *þ — pe* "until?" See also 317, 10. 12; and perhaps also 322, 35; 323, 1 (after the verb *anbidian*).

Morris, in his *Blickl. Homilies*, expands regularly *pæt*. This has led him into two blunders, one of translation, one of gender. Page 189, 2 the ejaculation *freme nu forpon þ þu ongunne*, where we are dealing merely with the familiar phrase *forpon þe* — "because" and the speaker says: "Go on, since thou hast begun," Morris translates "Accomplish what thou didst begin." What becomes of the *forpon*, in this rendering?

Still more unfortunate is *þa welan and pæt mycèle gyld* 53, 21. On the strength of this single passage and the assumption *þ — pæt*, Morris enters *gyld* in his glossary as masculine or neuter. The word is unmistakably mascu-

* My line-numbering for the Chronicle is by year and page.

line throughout. See all the other passages in the Blick. H.; also Bosworth-Toller; Pastoral 463, 30; 463, 34; 209, 18; 57, 18; 85, 7; Oros. 214, 1. We need not hesitate to look upon *p* here as = *pe* and treat it as we would Dipa (sc. Dido) *pe wifmon*, Oros. 252, 17.

It is clear, then, that if *p* may stand for *pa*, *pæs*, *pone* (or *pam*, *pan*), *pio*, and *pe*, the sooner our editors cease to tamper with it the better.

GOD-WRACU.

Sievers's collection of adjectives in -u, §303, is confessedly very meagre. May I venture to add one, on the strength of *pone godwracan peof*, Blick. Hom. 75, 26?

CEAST, CEST.

Bosworth-Toller gives the word = "strife," but is uncertain as to its gender. The forms *lites* = *ceasta*, E. Stud. IX, 36. b 17, and *togenes pære ceaste*, Aelf. SS. 182, 212 fix it as feminine. Hitherto no one—to my knowledge—has thrown any light on its etymology. Is it not borrowed from the Latin *quaestio* through the Celtic *cest*? M'Alpine's Gaelic Dictionary gives *ceisd* = question, doubt, anxiety.

GE-LAERE — LEER, EMPTY.

Acc. S. M. *gelærne*, E. Stud. VIII, 474, 52 Kluge, p. 472, pronounces this word *ἀπαξ λεγούσεον*. Undoubtedly it is very rare. But cf.: *ponne se geolsa of pære idlan wambe cymð 7 of pære gelærnan, ne bet pone se fnora*, "when the hicket cometh of the foul womb and of the leer or empty one, the sneezing doth not amend it." Leechd. II, 62, 1; and *of to micelre lærenesse* = emptiness, Leechd. II, 60, 20.

J. M. HART.

University of Cincinnati.

TWO WORDS OF DUTCH ORIGIN.

FLY, a "marsh," occurs in no American dictionary. Stormonth prints: "VLEI OR FLY *flā* [Dutch *vlei* a marsh], in *S. Africa*, a marsh; a swamp," etc. In the wooded region to the north of the Mohawk river, in the state of New York, embracing parts of Fulton, Herkimer, and Oneida Counties, the word [pronounced *flai*] is now specifically applied to a sphagnum swamp, or a beaver meadow, in which sense it has often been heard by the writer. An en-

gineer of the new Forestry Commission, to whom I applied, states that he has had occasion, too, to use the word in its local meaning.

The word, spelled *vlye*, or *vly*, [Dutch *vleij* = French *vallée*; English *valley*], meaning a marsh, or a marshy meadow, frequently occurs in Colonial documents, describing the patents and land grants. In old New York, *Smits Vly* (afterward Queen Street, now a part of Pearl Street), according to early accounts low and marshy, gave its name to the historical Fly Market which stood at the intersection of Maiden Lane and Pearl Street.

BEER CREEK. Several tap-rooms, or, more properly, "saloons," in New York bear the somewhat peculiar title of "Beer Creek" [in the local pronunciation, *krik*]. The name is, of course, suggestive of a flowing abundance. Why, however, "Creek" a word in this locality of infrequent application, rather than 'brook', or even 'river'? The name is, apparently, a folk-etymology that goes back to a Dutch prototype. *Bierkroeg* [Bier + Kroeg: German, *Krug*, Swedish, *Krog*, Danish, *Kro*; all in the same signification, an ale-house] is a common appellation for an ale-house in Holland and, manifestly, may have been, during the Dutch possession, thus applied here.

It is by no means an isolated case of the change of a Dutch form through the influence of mistaken analogy. Arthur Kill, for instance, was *Aghter Kil* (as it is given on the old maps), the back channel; *Boompjes Hoek*, tree point, became Bombay Hook; *Kreupelbosch*, thicket, is now Cripplebush, and there are many others which will be cited in a subsequent article.

WM. H. CARPENTER.

Columbia College.

NOTES ON THE FINNSAGA.

I.

In his book entitled "Das Altenglische Volksepos in der ursprünglichen strophischen Form," p. 46 ff. Möller has successfully removed many of the difficulties which had hitherto opposed the interpretation of the Anglo-Saxon fragment known as "The Fight of Finnsburg" and of the corresponding episode in Beowulf. The correctness of his conclusion, that the combat described in the fragment is

not the one in which Hnæf was killed, as had generally been assumed, but that it must have taken place subsequently to the treaty concluded by Finn and Hengest, will scarcely be called into question. In ascertaining the exact place in the episode where the events of the fragment come in, Möller has, however, been less fortunate. For some reason which he does not assign, he seems to object to the manuscript reading "woroldrædenne" in line 1142 of Beowulf (Wülker's edition), and he suggests instead (p. 68) "worod-(for "werod") rædenne," meaning "the wish of the retainers," analogous with "folcrædenne" = *plebiscitum* (Grein). The whole passage (lines 1142-1144) is rendered by him as follows: "Thus he (Finn!) did not oppose the wish of his retainers when the son of Hunlaf laid the war-gleam, the best of swords, upon his lap," and the meaning of this, Möller explains to be that the followers of Finn, being forbidden to mention the feud, symbolically expressed their eagerness to renew the combat by presenting their King with a renowned sword. Finn yields to the wish of his warriors, and the result is the nocturnal attack on Hengest described in the fragment. Ingenious as this interpretation of the passage is, it makes at once the impression of being far-fetched; a close examination will prove it to be untenable. In the first place, the pronoun 'he' in line 1140, can only mean Hengest, who is the subject of the preceding sentence; the argument of Möller (p. 67), that an exact logical use of the pronouns could not be expected in a poem which was nothing but a compilation of several different songs, is of no value to anybody except those who implicitly believe in his *Liedertheorie*, which we prefer not to discuss in this connection. Besides, it will be seen below that, contrary to Möller's theory, our passage forms, with the immediately preceding and following sentences, a continuous train of thought and is also syntactically very well connected with them. But, apart from these considerations, the supposed symbolical act of Finn's followers is in itself very suspicious. If it was carried out, as Möller supposes, in the common hall, in the presence of Hengest, who, as we know from lines 1138-1141, was himself wishing for an opportunity to avenge his fallen countrymen, it is hard to believe that the parties should then have peacefully walked off to their

respective quarters and that the Frisians should have waited for the night to attack their enemies, whom they certainly could not expect to take by surprise, after the ample warning they had given them.

The fundamental idea in Möller's interpretation is, that the Frisians chose a symbolical method of expressing their hostile sentiments, because the terms of the treaty forbade them "*frecnan spræce ðæs morþorhetes myndzian*" (1104-1105), "to mention the deadly feud in bold speech;" but, in this, Möller imputes to the Frisians a mode of reasoning which is at best very sophistical. According to line 1095, Finn and Hengest "*ȝetruwedon on twa healfé fæste friðuwære*," that is, they concluded and solemnly vowed to keep a treaty which was to establish and, as we see from its wording, to permanently preserve peaceful relations between them; any attempt to bring about a renewal of hostilities was therefore *a priori* a breach of the treaty and the Frisians, in acting as Möller supposes, accordingly violated, if not the letter, at least the spirit of the compact. It must, moreover, appear very singular that they should have so scrupulously adhered to a minor clause of a treaty which they were ready to disregard in its entirety; they could certainly not have been afraid of the punishment provided in that clause, if they were unanimous in their desire to fight. An examination of the treaty in its details, which are uncommonly clear and comprehensive, shows on the contrary that the possibility of an event such as Möller assumes is fully provided for; it says there (1099-1101), they resolved that "no man should break the treaty *either by words or by deeds*, nor should (they) ever violate it *purh inwitsearo*, by treacherous or cunning design." The latter half of this passage, which, by a loose construction not uncommon in Anglo-Saxon, depends for its subject upon the clause immediately following, grammatically refers to the retainers of Hengest; the first half of it may refer to either party. Then comes the point mentioned above, that "if any one of the Frisians was mindful of the deadly feud in bold speech, the edge of the sword should avenge it" (1104-1105). It is evident that we are not to infer from these passages, as Möller does, that only *Hengest's men* were forbidden to violate the treaty '*by words or deeds*,'

or "*purh invitsearo*," while the *Frisians* were free to act as they pleased, provided they did not speak of the feud; the clause touching the maintenance of peace must, in justice and equity, have applied to both sides alike. The supposed symbolical act of the Frisians, accordingly, if it was not a direct breach of the compact by a deed, would certainly have come under the term "*invitsearo*."

Thus we see, that Möller's proposed emendation not only does violence to the syntactical connection of the passage, but that it is in itself improbable and, besides, cannot be brought into harmony with the remainder of the text. The following explanations will show that there is, moreover, no call for any change in the original text; that the passage, as it stands, admits of an easy and natural translation and gives in every respect excellent sense.

The manuscript reading "*woroldræden*" has in it nothing extraordinary. The element "*ræden*" is rare as a separate word, but quite common as the second member of compounds, adding in such cases merely an abstract force, like the modern suffix "-ship" as in *freondræden*, *mægræden*, *campdræden* (militia, Grein), *wigræden* and others, or conveying the idea of a council, a decree, or law as in *folc-ræden*, *frumræden* (prædestinatio, Gr.), *unræden* (malum consilium, Gr.), *gecwidræden* (agreement. See Orosius, ed. Sweet, p. 242, an instance especially in point). In the connection of lines 1142-1144, in Beowulf, it is therefore natural to translate *woroldræden*, as our best authorities did, by "the way (the fate) of the world." The fact that the word only occurs in this one instance, is no reason whatever for rejecting it; the same is the case, as far as we know, with several of the above compounds (*camp-*, *folc-*, *frum-*, *wigræden*) and with a considerable number of other words whose genuineness is nevertheless unquestioned.

Möller's translation of the expression, "*on bearm dyde*" (1144), as "laid upon his lap," of course stands or falls with his reading "*worodriædenne*." The rendering which naturally suggests itself to an unbiased reader, and which has been generally adopted, is, "did (i. e. thrust) into his breast," and this version, besides being in keeping with "*woroldræden*," is supported by several important circumstances. In the first place, Hengest must have actually

met with his death some time previously to the closing events of the Saga; for he is not mentioned again after line 1144, and we are told that Guðlaf and Oslaf, his followers, "after the sea-journey sorrowfully lamented (or announced?) the grim grip (attack)" (1148), from which we may infer, as in fact Möller does, that the attack on Hengest's party, despite the valiant defense of the hall described in the fragment, finally resulted in a complete victory for the Frisians, and that Guðlaf and Oslaf alone succeeded in escaping to their country, whence they afterwards returned with reinforcements to avenge the death of their comrades. But a fact of such prime importance as the death of Hengest, could not escape mention, even in an epic song which lays no claim to completeness; the above interpretation of lines 1142-44 is therefore not only justified, but necessary. In the second place, conclusive evidence in favor of it is furnished by the sentence immediately following. It says there (1146f.): "Likewise (*swylce*) mortal swordbale afterwards befell courageous Finn." The adverb "likewise" logically connects this sentence with the preceding one and thus places it beyond doubt that the latter must have contained an account of a similar event, that is, of the death of some man by the sword; this man of course cannot have been Finn. Möller tries to evade this point by assuming (p. 67) that line 1146 "was taken from a song quite different from that which contained the words before it, and that the "likewise" therefore followed the latter by mere accident;" but, two pages farther on, he contradicts himself by remarking, rather obscurely, that "the compiler of the episode, by placing the passage beginning with "likewise" immediately after line 1145, probably meant to signify that Hengest had fallen in the combat."

If lines 1142-44 contain the report of Hengest's death, the observation appended to them concerning the fame of Hunlaf's sword (1145), also gives very good sense; it may either signify "its (the sword's) edges were known among the Eotens" ("*wærōn*" referring to the time after Hengest's death), or by taking the word "*pæs*" as an adverb the meaning may be rendered still more impressive: "in consequence of this (event) the (its) edges were known, etc."

The thought of the whole passage, lines 1136-1151, is clear and logically continuous. Hengest was meditating revenge and planning a "hostile meeting;" *thus (swa)* it was that he did not escape the fate of the world, that is death, in that Hunlafing thrust the sword into his breast. *In a like manner (swylce)*, Finn himself afterwards lost his life, etc. It only remains for us to conjecture that Hengest, by his manner and conduct, provoked the Frisians to anticipate his designs by taking, themselves, the initiative.

It is, then, clearly seen that the events of the Finnsburg fragment are to be placed in the Finn episode in Beowulf between lines 1141 and 1142.

HUGO SCHILLING.

Baltimore.

A NATIONAL MOVEMENT IN GERMANY.

In 1882 Prof. Dr. H. Riegel, of Braunschweig, published a pamphlet entitled: "Ein Hauptstück von unserer Muttersprache. Mahnruf an alle national gesinnten Deutschen" (Leipzig, F. W. Grunow), in which he preached a new crusade against the foreign words infecting like a "pestilence" the body of the German language. His words were not spoken to the winds. Most of the newspapers not only applauded, but reformed; several authors joined their voices to his war-cry; Dr. Daniel Sanders published in 1884 his "Verdeutschungswörterbuch," containing all foreign words in common use together with their respective proper German substitutes; certain magistrates, clubs, and corporations labored for the good cause, and the Grand Duke of Saxe-Weimar, following the noble example of Duke Wilhelm, of Saxe-Weimar, who from 1651-1662 presided over the so-called Fruit-bringing Society, took a step in the right direction by having the magistrates of his state directed to avoid all unnecessary foreign words in their official reports, but especially in the publication of decrees, ordinances, etc.

Encouraged by this success, Dr. Riegel conceived the plan of calling into life a society whose object and outlines of organization he laid before the public in his pamphlet, "Der allgemeine deutsche Sprachverein" (Heil-

bronnt, 1885), and inspirited by this document, a body of highly distinguished men, amongst others the poets H. Allmers, Fr. von Bodenstedt, R. Hamerling, and E. Scherenberg, issued an appeal to the German nation for the founding of a general society whose object should be the cultivation of the German language in general, and its purification from unnecessary foreign elements in particular. With reference to the latter, the call expressly declared that the association would use the utmost moderation and carefully avoid all exaggeration; that it recognized a certain class of indispensable foreign words, and intended to fight only those intruders, especially French, for which the German language offers satisfactory equivalents. The guiding principle should be: "No foreign word for what can be properly expressed in German."

The appeal, which invited to the formation of branch-societies throughout Germany, as well as over all foreign countries where the German idiom is spoken, met in all classes of society everywhere with a warm reception, and numerous branch organizations have since sprung up,* while others are still forming, so that there can scarcely be any doubt that this war against foreign words is an eminently popular one. Add to this, that the leaders seem to be possessed, from the tenor of their appeal, with a spirit of prudence and moderation such as will not give any occasion for ridiculing the enterprise, and there seems to be no reason why the object of the movement should not be reached, provided, however, (this point is to be emphasized) the word "*unnecessary*", used by the reformers, be taken in its restricted sense. It should embrace only those foreign words for which there really exist unobjectionable substitutes in German; as, for example, *invitieren* for *einladen*, *Soirée* for *Abendgesellschaft*, and hosts of others, which will proba-

*In the first number of the "Zeitschrift des allgemeinen deutschen Sprachvereins," edited by Dr. Riegel, which appeared on April 1, 1886, we find twenty-two organized branch-societies enumerated, to which number twelve more are added in the second number, of May 6.

We learn in the same periodical that a society under the name of "Deutscher Sprachverein" has lately been formed at Weimar under the protection of the Grand Duke, which is to extend over the entire state of Saxe-Weimar-Eisenach, but, we regret to say, is not to figure as a branch association, but will have an independent existence.

bly fall into well-deserved contempt. On the other hand, if the word *unnecessary* be taken in its broad signification, the success of the movement seems to me very doubtful. There is, indeed, a large class of foreign vocables which can be styled neither necessary, because there exist German substitutes for them, nor unnecessary, because these substitutes have not yet been fully sanctioned by usage. A representative of this class is the word *Sauce*, for which *Tunke* has been proposed, a most excellent German word, certainly, and yet one that nobody will receive without a smile, for the simple reason that usage has not properly extended its sphere, but has allowed the parasite *Sauce* to stifle it and occupy its rightful place, while our mental associations clustering around *Tunke* lack the dignity and nicety of its aristocratic rival. In the same way, a large number of native words capable of a many-sided development have been stunted, especially by French intruders, and I entertain no hope of seeing the writers of the day avail themselves of these starvelings until they have been nurtured into new life and strength. The proper nurseries, I think, would be the schools, and the foundation for the German language of an Imperial Academy, a suggestion that has already been urged by Prof. Riegel.

Thus, judging from the nature of things at present as well as from the experiences of the past, the new Society, placed as it is in the dilemma of going either too far or not far enough, has taken upon itself a task of extraordinary difficulty; but for this very reason its patriotic efforts excite our admiration, and enlist our sympathies and moral support.

H. C. O. HUSS.

Princeton College.

IS MACAULAY'S VOCABULARY
MORE LATINIZED THAN
DE QUINCEY'S?

Prof. Cook's elaborate computations of the relative proportions of native and foreign elements in the vocabularies of De Quincey and Macaulay (see *MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES*, numbers 2 and 5) are of great interest and importance. Probably, however, most attentive readers of these authors will be surprised at

his conclusion, that De Quincey is "more Anglican than Macaulay at his best," and will find little in the facts as set forth to justify it. Professor Cook's estimates are based upon some ten thousand words from the beginning of the 'Opium Eater', and upon five thousand words from Macaulay's 'Essay on History' and an equal number from his article on 'Johnson' in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Now, any one who has given attention to the subject knows how the relative proportions of Latin and English words vary with the subject of discourse, with the audience in view, with the mood and aim of the writer, etc. Especially is this likely to be true of so vivacious, volatile, and whimsical a writer as De Quincey. Professor Cook's conclusion is, therefore, invalidated by the fact that his analysis of De Quincey's vocabulary is based upon a familiar personal narrative, while that of Macaulay's is based upon biography and criticism. Take De Quincey when he is upon good behavior, as in his 'Essay on Shakspere' (Riverside edition, vol. vi.), and it will surely be found that the proportion of Latin words is considerably greater than in the 'Opium Eater'.

It is well known that Macaulay was always upon good behavior, even in his conversation; nevertheless, he probably does not use the same proportion of Latin words in plain narrative as in abstract exposition or argument. This consideration, again, invalidates Professor Cook's estimate of the elements of Macaulay's vocabulary at different periods of his life. The 'Essay on History' is a diffuse, critical and theoretical dissertation; the 'Life of Johnson' is a compact narrative. At any time of his life, Macaulay, or any man, would be apt to Latinize more in the former kind of composition than in the latter.

In order to make a fair comparison between the vocabularies of these or any other authors, it will be necessary to compare separately the wording in the different kinds of composition. The whole method of treatment must be carefully taken into consideration. Thus, it would hardly be fair to compare De Quincey's 'Essay on Shakspere' with Macaulay's 'Johnson', although both were written for the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. For De Quincey's article is chiefly critical and argumentative, and might far more justly be compared with

the latter part of Macaulay's 'Essay on Bacon'. Perhaps 'The Flight of a Tartar Tribe' is as pure an example of a narrative of any length as can be found in De Quincey, but its style is so scenical that it would be obviously misleading to compare it with Macaulay's 'Johnson'. In fine, literary, personal, and historical narratives are distinct categories which involve different vocabularies and should, therefore, in these estimates, be considered separately.

MELVILLE B. ANDERSON.

Knox College.

GRAMMAR WANTED.

I heartily agree with my friend Prof. Garner that we need an improved English grammar. It is time that this long martyrdom of our language on the rack of the Latin grammarians should cease, and that we should have a grammar founded on logic and recognition of the operations of the mind.

If the trouble lay only in nice questions or delicate distinctions, such as those connected with the moods, the need would not be so urgent; but in most grammars confusion and irrationality reign in even the elementary principles.

Take, for example, the question of case. I open the first grammar before me, a book of eight hundred mortal pages (to say nothing of four pages of recommendations in which it is lauded to the skies)—and under the head of *case* I find the following statements:—

"Case denotes the relation which a noun sustains to other words in the sentence Nouns have three cases."—and a little farther:—

"It has been a question how many cases should be admitted in the English language. If a change of termination is essential to constitute a case there are but two cases If, on the other hand, it should be claimed [sic] that the use of a preposition constitutes a case, then there are as many cases as there are prepositions. We are therefore justified, on the ground of convenience, in admitting at least three cases."

From this we learn that this grammarian is of opinion that nouns, in English at least, have but three relations to each other; that he is quite uncertain what constitutes a case; (could he not have postponed writing his grammar

until he had gained some light on this point?) but that whatever a case may be, he is justified in admitting three of them. (We also see that he would perceive no logical error in this proposition: "if the use of a crown constitutes a king, there are in every monarchy as many kings as there are crowns.")

So a man can write eight hundred pages of grammar without discovering these simple facts about nouns:

First, that grammatical case is the conventional indication in language of the kind of relation existing between the *things* spoken of; and as many kinds of relations as there are between things, be they three or three million, so many cases are there, whether grammarians choose to admit them, or not. To say that any case is wanting to any language, is to say that there is a kind of relation between things that cannot be expressed in that language.

Secondly, that the signs of cases are very different things from the cases themselves; that identical cases may have different signs, and different cases identical signs.

Thirdly, that the cases which indicate identical relations must be identical, whatever the sign may be. If we call the case of *king* possessive in the phrase "the king's crown," the case is identical in "the crown of the king," or if we put it in French and say "la couronne du roi." Whatever we may choose to call the cases of *mihi* and *gladio* in the phrases "da mihi malum," "occidit eum gladio," they are identical with those of *me* and *sword* in the corresponding phrases "give me an apple," "he slew him with a sword." Conversely, "him," in the phrases "I brought him the letter," and "I brought him home," is in different cases, although the form is the same.

So with regard to "government." My grammarian, of course, says "prepositions govern the objective case." In another place, "*the wisdom of man* has been called the analytical possessive." Again, "prepositions are sometimes understood; as, 'he gave me a book' = 'he gave to me a book.'" "These are remains of dative forms and may be parsed without the aid of a preposition." "In the phrase 'give it him' we have a dative case. The objective case and the preposition *to* are often equivalent to the dative case." Surely a grammarian ought to know whether a given

case was possessive, dative, or objective, or whether a preposition was or was not understood. Great is the might of prepositions. *Him*, in "give him," is dative, but, though the same form, in the same relation, and with the same power, it becomes an objective when it gets *to* before it.

It seems never to occur to grammarians of this calibre to inquire how prepositions came to be invested with this singular power, and when the son of crooked-counselled Kronos put the sceptre into their little hands that they should rule over substantives. How can one part of speech govern another? They govern just as the storm-signal governs the storm, or the clock the flight of time. In the phrase "I slew him with a sword," *with* no more governs *sword* than it governs Ireland: it indicates the relation that a sword bore in a given action, to the persons represented by *I* and *him*.

But my grammarian would probably answer: "Your objections are captious. I know that a word really does not govern another word, but it is a handy way of putting it. Instead of saying 'those Latin constructions which require the preposition *ad* also require the accusative of the noun,' it is more convenient to say '*ad* governs the accusative.'" To which I reply that what may be convenient for grammarians is infinitely confusing for children, and that I know of no charter that grammarians have above other folks to talk nonsense or say the thing that is not.

I never met a child that did not abominate formal grammar, and no wonder.

WM. HAND BROWNE.

Böhmer's *Romanische Studien*, Heft XX. and XXI. Bonn, 1883-85.

These two last numbers of the 'Studien' are wholly devoted to Rætian studies. In Heft XX., Böhmer gives in chronological order a full description of almost all the manuscripts and books ever written or printed in any of the Rætian dialects from the sixteenth century down to 1883; besides this, every pamphlet, article, review or catalogue relating to the Rætian language, or literature, is mentioned. The first article of Heft XXI. (pp. 219-238 and p. 335) continues this list down to 1885, adding

to the fourteen hundred and fifty-seven numbers of Heft XX. one hundred and sixty-one others, and making corrections and observations on about one hundred and fifty of the catalogue of 1883.

These catalogues contain, then, sixteen hundred and eighteen articles (the Grisons having the lion's share with eleven hundred and ninety numbers; next comes Friaul with two hundred and ninety-one and, finally, Tyrol with one hundred and thirty-seven). This is by far the highest number ever reached by any catalogue, or history, of Rætian literature.

We need not say of this list, since it is made by Böhmer, that it is prepared with the utmost accuracy. Misprints or omissions, although next to inevitable in such work, are indeed very rare. All such inexactnesses that I have noticed are the following:

Ten Blätter for eleven in R. 1739, 'Soings discurs'; *oblīca de for obliea da* in Sm. 1755; *Cudasch... respondar* for *Cudasch... responder* in Sm. 1857; *Cudasch...* und zwar unrichtig gestellte for *Cudasch* in Sm. 1859; 133 S. for 153 in Oe. 1865, 'Poesias da Caratsch,' and the following omissions:

Oe. 1765, 'Alchūnas domandas davart chiosas fondamentaadas...' Cellerina, 8vo.

To R. 1829-81 (p. 140), add:

1869, 30(6), 'Project tier ina constituziun revida...' ;

R. 1872, 'Lescha federala concerment la revisiun della constituziun federala dils 12 de Sett. 1848, 32 pp., 4to;

R. 1867, 'Salis Marschlins' in Ebert's Jahrbuch VIII. 228-34;

R. 1868, I. I. F. Vincenz, 'Cudisch de devozion ed instrucziun,' 333 pp. Sm. 8vo;

R. 1872, P. Th. Florentini, 'Legendari della vita dils sogns,' Cuera;

Tyrol: 18th century, Bartholomei, 'Grednerisches Wörterverzeichniss.'

1839, Staffler (I. I.), 'Tirol & Vorarlberg';

1866, Schöpf & Hofer, 'Tiroler Idiotikon,' Innsbruck;

1877, Schneller, 'Skizzen und Kulturbilder aus Tirol';

Rætia: 1666, Buccelinus, 'Rhætia Etrusca Gallica Romana,' Aug. Vind. 4to;

1872, Planta, 'Das alte Rætien,' Berlin, 8vo;

1874, Juvalt (W.), 'Forschung über die Feudalzeit in Curisch Rætien.' Zürich.

To complete the list I add the following manuscripts:

R. 1720 (?) 'Fuorma dilg dreig civil,' 39 l. 4to= R. 1731;

R. 1748-49, 'Legends of S. Ulrich, Genoveva, Giosofat, Eufrosina, Gelletta, Maria Magdalena, Petronella.'

R. 18th century, 'La dertgira nauscha' (—edit. of Decurtins);

R. 1818 (?), Two MSS. of the 'passiun de Somvitg' (ed. Decurtins);

R. 1803, 1820, 1821, 1823, four small religious documents of Schoms in verse and prose, 4 l. in 8vo + 2 l. in fol. + 1 l. in folio;

R. 1806, one legal document of Schoms in prose, 2 l. in fol.;

R. 18(19) century, a similar one in the dialect of Muntagna, 1 l. in 8vo;

R. 1878 (?), P. Enrico Valle, 'Il Figliuol Prodigio,' Dramma. Roma 1863. Translated by Fl. Spescha;

R. 1883, I. A. Bühlér, 'Rimas humoristicas en dialect da Domat,' 8 l. 8vo;

Sm. 1820 and 1883, two protocols 'digl cu-meign da Savognin';

Oe. 1591, modern copy of the 'Aestimum Sely' of 1591, 14 l. 4to;

Oe. 1640, 'Historia dalg arick hum, dalla Süssanna, dals traïs Juvans,' 83 l. 4to;

Oe. 1644, 'Historia dalla Süssanna, dals traïs Juvans, dalla.... Cicilia,' 49 l. 4to;

Oe. 1658, 'Descriptiun dalg saschinamaint dalla Wall d'Wuttina,' written by Iach. Frizun;

Oe. 1658-96, 1684, 1696, 1724, 1727, 1728, 1748 and beginning of 18th century, 9 collections of religious songs, 46 + 4 + 9 + 10 + 35 + 11 + 30 + 45 l. in 12mo;

Oe. 1661, 'Histoargia da.... Joseph,' in verse, and the history of Lady Jane Gray in prose, 25 l. 4to;

Oe. 1686, five religious, three political songs, one 'saltaer dals moarts' and 'la prouva da d'Abraham';

Oe. 1717 (?), 'Statüts dalg hundro Comoen da Bravoin,' 96 l. in 4to (—MS. Add. 27388, of the Brit. Mus., not mentioned by Varnhagen);

Oe. 1717 and end of 18th century, three MSS. of sermons, 9 + 12 + 16 l. in 4to;

Oe. 1746, Catechism, 10 l. in 12mo;

Oe. 18th century, collection of religious and political songs, 184 l. in 4to;

Oe. 18(19) century, legal and historical documents, 280 l. 4to;

Oe. end of 19th century, political song (—Bühler's *Novellist I*, 62) 6 l. 4to;

Oe. 1810-40, charters;

Oe. 19th century, 'La chünna' (romance), 5 l. folio;

E. 1746, collection of religious songs 83 l.

Ue. 1686, thirteen religious songs and 'ilg sacrifici da d'Abraham';

Ue. 1761, 1794, 21 + 4 l. 8vo, two formulares (similar to those published in Gröber's *Ztschr. VI*, 570 ff.);

M. 18(19) century, 'Regulatif....dal vaschinadi de Terzal d'aint,' 2 l. in folio;

M. 1863, two poems of Fl. Pitsch, 81. folio.

On some of the books registered by Böhmer, I have a few observations to make:

R. 1601, 'Catechismus.. da Daniel Bonifaci.' The copy preserved at the Brit. Mus., although of the same place and date, seems to belong to a revised edition, as the variants given below will show (p. 98, col. 195);

R. 1686, this first edition of Joh. Moeli's, 'Soings Discurs' has 570 pp. + 4 l. in 12mo. Neither the name nor the poems of Barnabas Moeli are in this first edition;

Oe. 1651, a copy, as it seems, of the same edition of Gritt's 'Oratiuns' (for it is of equal size and equal number of pages and lines, as far as page 417, and printed in the same type) differs from Oe. 1651 in this respect only, that 'Oratiun XXXII. (pp. 418-25) has been left out and, in compensation, a shorter one, in verse, of 3½ pages and printed in different type, has been added at the end. It is on account of this change, that the copy in question has only 423 pp. instead of 428. I cannot give the precise date of this edition, as my copy has lost the title pages of the 'Oratiuns' as well as of the 'Bells ditts.' It may be well to notice, that the last page of the 'Register' contains seven Latin distichs entitled 'Ad | benevolum | lectorum,' and signed by Georgius a Vizeliis | Zuziensis Rhetus.

Oe. 1776, Fritzun's 'Catechismus.' The appendix of this 'catechismus' consists of two parts, the 'Alchüns dumandas'.. (pp. 1-10) being followed by 'Alchüns bels dits della moart'.. (pp. 11-15).

In the second article of Heft XXI. (pp. 239-299), Gartner publishes for the first time a very

important text for the study of the Engadine dialect, for it is, with the exception of Bifrun's translation of the New Testament, the only sixteenth century document of the language of Upper Engadine. The MS. from which the text is taken gives neither the title of the piece nor the name of its author, but Böhmer (in his *Verzeichniss* of 1883, just mentioned, p. 178) and the editor are certainly right in calling it Gebhard Stuppaun's 'Zehn Alter,' "the ten ages of human life;" for the text proves to be a free translation of the German biblical drama, 'Die Zehen Alter,' of Pamphilus Gengenbach; and Durich Chiampell (+1582) speaks of such a drama as having been composed by Gebh. Stuppaun and represented at Ardetz, Lower Engadine, on Easter 1564 (in *feriis paschatis* drama de decem hominis ætatis authore Gebhardo Stuppano Rhætius rhythmicis compositum Ardeatii publice actum. 'Historia Rhætica,' l. ii, cap. 67). Gartner's edition seems to be a faithful reproduction of the MS., with the exception of the few abbreviations, the accents, and the consonants *j* and *v*, as mentioned in the preface (pp. 243-4), and of a dozen emendations as explained in the footnotes. These deviations from the original are certainly slight, but still I cannot approve even of these. To my mind, there are only two ways of editing old texts: the making of either reprints or critical editions. Eclecticism, as represented here, is unscientific and ought therefore to be abandoned.

The text is followed by a careful review of the most interesting forms and by a complete glossary, which will be useful and interesting even to "those who know," for it contains several expressions not found elsewhere. Two words only seem to have been overlooked, viz.: 525 *sch'dischagio* "misrepresented, disfigured," and 1070 *tscharner* or rather *tscherner* "to choose." The two words *staeglian* (439) and *us-chigliae* (467) are certainly misprints for *stoeglian* and *uschiglioë*, and therefore not registered. Of some others, not all the necessary significations have been given; for example, *da co che*, means not only "as" but also "because," "of that which," 141; *co go*, "which" (rel.); *tuot*, 94, 122, 165, 172, etc. = "every, each;" *mner*, 82, "to bring, to carry;" *metter suott*, 115, "to put lower down, to disparage;" *s'tegnar amaua*, 141, "to be about;"

havair per mauns, 144, "to follow" (a trade); *pür*, 154, 319, "however;" *ludaer* (1) "advice," (2) 173 "pleasure;" *sur iina uartt*, 176, "aside, apart;" *miuing*, 189, "I go away, leave;" the Infinitive is *ir* or rather *sinir* (cf. *singiaien*, Bif. *Math.* 14, 16; *tzinvaun*, Chiamp. *Ps.* 37, 10; *tzinvaal*, Chiamp. *chianz.* p. 487; *minir*, Bif. *Math.* 8, 21 is an accus. c. inf.), the first person sing. Pres. Ind. of *ire* being already in the oldest texts (= *venio*); for example, *innua eau veng*, "quo vado," Gritti, *Joh. VIII*, 14, 21, 23; *eau sinveng* (ib. 21) "ego vado," Mod. Engad. "e(a)u vegn davent;" *ir per cour*, 252, "to go to heart, to touch;" *sainza fall*, 554, "without fail," Germ. "unfehlbar;" *bouff*, 812, 816, "bull;" *dains*, 919, "finger;" *larg*, 998, "free."

Three very singular mistakes are: 111, *int-schins*, "incense," instead of "tricks, artifices," the word being — Lat. *ingenium* and not — *incensum*; 242, *laschaint*, interpreted as gerund of *laschaer* "to let," whilst it is Lat. *licentem* (cf. Ascoli, *Arch.* VII, 496-599) "idle, not having obtained anything;" 537, *bischa*, "Thier, beast," instead of *fresh snow*, *bischa* (pr. *biza*) — French *bise*; for the meaning of the word, cf. Swiss-Germ. "Windswehete" — "fresh snow."

Agurbir, 86, 859, etc. means rather "to acquire," Germ. "erwerben," (according to its origin) than "to obtain;" *astint*, 112, etc., rather "pains," Germ. "mühē" than "noth;" *metaunt*, 773, is probably Old Fr. *mitan* "tenancy, farm" (Etym., see Diez, s. v.); *otar*, 826, 1279 "but," German "als;" *partschett*, 1187 (=lat. *perceptus*) "perceived;" *gnir p* — "to perceive," Germ. "inne werden;" *esser p* — "to be sure, certain;" *schrapinain*, 703, read *strapinain*, "we scold," or *srapinain*, "we tear, rend" (?).

Pages 299-302, of Heft. XXI, 'Corrections to Ulrich's reprints of Bifrun's New Testament (Ev. Math. & Marc.) and of Bonifaci's Catechism'. These corrections, made by Gartner after a careful collation of forty-pages (pp. 1-35 and 162-66) of Bifrun and of the whole text of Bonifaci with the original, show that these reprints are made as carelessly as the other publications of the same editor, whole sentences having been omitted. When Ulrich's first edition (1880) of Bonifaci appeared, I compared this publication with a copy of the original pre-

served at the Brit. Mus., and noted the same faults as Gartner, except, 1122, 1440, *mussameint*, which is a misprint for *mussameint*, and the following : 834 la (da); 865, dae (da); 1065, quella (questa); 1182, dellg (della); 1279, guivintschellas (giuvintschellas); 1328, auter (auter); 1352, adatgth (adagth); 1343, guivnal (giuvnal); 1358, avanut (avaunt), which have all been corrected in the second edition. But, in the following passages, the London copy has readings so divergent and always so much better that this copy must belong to a revised edition, as suggested above, (p. 96, col. 192).

Between 137 and 138 (174 and 175) add as title :

'Dals sänghs X commendamein(t)s.'

183(231-2) reads thus : 'nagüna figüra ne sumeglia ne da quellas chausas ch.'

186(236) *hundrar* and *adorar* are inverted.

232(299) and 234(301) *Deus.* (igl Signer).

248(319-20) *igl teas (teu)* and *la tia (tia)*.

249(321) *la quala (ch')*.

328(422) *gavischeare (garagear)*.

420(548) the first *eint in*, 'tutt eint in.'

Between 531 and 532, add the number 4, corresponding to 3, [522(678)] and to 5 [573(745)], between 677 and 678 (878 and 79) the number 10 corresponding to 9 [659(853)] and 11 [685(887)] and at the beginning of 1060 (1361) add 66 corresponding to 65, line 1055 (1354) and to 67, l. 1073 (1378).

638(829) *nossa (la nossa)*.

648(839) *perpetua (perpetua, Amen)*.

809(1046) *peccadurs (culpaunts)*, a necessary correction.

1024(1316) *substantialmeng (substantialameng)*.

1140(1466) *frütg üttel (frütg et üttel)*, the *et* is of course necessary.

The lines 1154-58, 1484-90 have been suppressed.

1231(1639) *schbittar*, Gartner *schbirar (schbrischer)*.

This *schbrischer* is the corresponding Engad. expression for *schbittar* and the presence of the Engad. form in the Brit. Mus. copy is accounted for as follows :

The page on which the passage occurs is very badly printed, so that the letters are nearly all effaced. In order to make good this deficiency, an early possessor of the copy (a certain inhabitant of Zuotz, Upper Engadine, in the 17th century), has written out the text on

the same page, and introduced by inadvertency this word of his own dialect, as well, also, as his own spelling of other words.

1290(1767) *fae (als fæ)*.

Under the head of 'W. v. Humboldt über Rätoromanisches, nebst Ungedrucktem von Matth. Conradi' (pp. 303-33), Gartner publishes some letters of Humboldt to M. Conradi, also a short etymological vocabulary, a collection of Latin, Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, French and German sayings with translation in the dialect of Surselva and, finally, a German fable in verse and a German poem with translation in this same idiom—all by Conradi.

In the next short article, entitled 'Zum Prädicatscasus' (pp. 334-5), Böhmer makes some additions to his essay on the 'Prädicatscasus' in the Rätian dialects (Rom. Studien II., 210ff.); his observation that *dis*, "day-break," and *di*, "day," are nowadays two distinct words, is especially to be noted.

Pp. 336-38, *Beiblatt*.

J. STÜRZINGER.

Bryn Mawr College.

HISTORIES OF GERMAN LITERATURE.

A History of German Literature by W. SCHERER. Translated from the third German edition by Mrs. F. C. Conybeare. Edited by F. Max Müller. 2 vols. Oxford. At the Clarendon Press, 1886. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons.

The recent publication of a translation of Scherer's well-known history may properly be made the occasion for a brief review of the various authorities covering the same general subject. Before the appearance in 1880-83 of this work the history of German literature in its entirety had already been treated by numerous able writers from diverse standpoints: Gervinus, Goedeke, Koberstein, Bartsch, Kurz, Sanders, Vilmar, König, and many others, had traversed the ground with telescope and microscope, and had presented results to satisfy alike the scholar, the pedant, the specialist, and the general reader.

Gervinus, who is considered the creator of German literary history, was the first to comprise a complete and thorough discussion, from Ulfilas to Goethe, of the whole poetic

activity of the nation. Criticisms referring to his assumed effort to harmonize the growth and development of German literature at every stage with the growth and development of the German people, his evident exaltation of the critic's function, his somewhat ponderous style, and his tendency to render his narrative what Hillebrand calls "a species of patriotic pamphlet in five huge volumes," need not blind a foreign reader to the great value of his work. And although his asserted lack of poetic insight may alienate a certain class, while his irreconcilability with regard to the final turn of political events in Germany embittered his last days and has partly obscured his fame, yet in his own country his honor is still great. Of the last edition of the history, the first volume and part of the second were revised by Gervinus and Bartsch in common; but, after the former's death in 1871, Bartsch remained sole editor.

Equally necessary to the student is Goedeke's 'Grundriss zur Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung,' a work which has just undergone a thorough revision. The modest title gives little indication of the comprehensiveness of the contents. The author's design was to present the various periods from the *cultu-historisch* rather than the æsthetic standpoint, to distinguish in a general way the various tendencies and phases of those periods, to mention the writers and productions appearing at such epochs, and to point out the sources from which more detailed information might be drawn. This union of literary history with biography and bibliography has been accomplished with success; and the work, a monument of patient research, has become a recognized authority.

The Bartsch—Koberstein 'Grundriss der Geschichte der deutschen Nationalliteratur' flanks with Goedeke the scholar's desk. Appearing first as a mere sketch, expanded now into five solid volumes, it is in its present form a dry, clear production, severe in style, giving the pith of the subject, enriched by erudite foot-notes and extensive bibliographical references occupying more than one half of the entire space.

The title of Kurz's 'Geschichte der deutschen Literatur, mit ausgewählten Stücken aus den Werken der vorzüglichsten Schriftsteller,' ex-

plains the general character of the work, which is one of the best of its kind, and in many respects better than its kind. For while the selections are copious and comprehensive, the general narrative is animated, impartial, and pleasantly free from the flavor of routine writing.

König's 'Deutsche Literaturgeschichte' (twelve editions from 1878 to 1883) is one of a number of works illustrating a new departure in book-making, and was probably intended to supplant the good old pietistic family history of Vilmar, which from 1845 to 1883 has exhausted 21 editions. The subject-matter of the text does not always appear to come from the pen of one who writes as having authority; but the generous reproduction of old-fashioned wood-cuts and portraits, the numerous facsimiles of manuscript leaves, illustrations from illuminated missals, title-pages of original editions, autographs, and specimens of the handwriting of the various authors mentioned would doubtless cause Comenius to feel that his life had not been spent without fruit. Teachers of experience will not quarrel with the Teutonic critic who austere styles this kind of enterprise a *Bilderbuch*; yet they will not be deterred by any such severe attitude from availing themselves of this convenient and abundant collection of illustrative material. One must accept assistance where it may be found without expecting that a single manual will satisfy all requirements.

To such an enumeration as the above, one must add the titles of numberless treatises on special periods by such writers as Wackernagel, Martin, von Raumer and Piper for the earlier period, and Lemcke, Palm, Biedermann, Hettner, Mörikofer, Hillebrand, Schmidt, Gottschall, Haym and Brandes for the later period before completing any conspectus of the available material. Nevertheless, the work before us, a concise and scientific yet popular survey, may fairly be acknowledged as a fresh contribution. It is written in an energetic staccato style, full of originality, even if occasionally somewhat abrupt. Professor Scherer is acquainted, at first hand, with the entire field embraced by his work, and his opinions are none the less sound for being enforced with vigor. One of the highest critical authorities in Germany has said that Scherer's view in his

history was mainly that of the modern æsthetic school, and that the standpoint of the earlier time was disregarded. This criticism, even if just, will not detract from the interest of the work, nor will such a view be unwelcome. It is also charged by foreign critics that Scherer sits in judgment more frequently than he delineates or narrates, so that no comprehensive and perspicuous outline is yielded of the natural development of the literature; that he neglects biography, and affords no thorough-going review of the conditions of civilization during the different periods treated: in other words, that he actually demands of his readers some previous knowledge of the history, literature and national life of the people whose literary monuments he is describing, and that he has not accomplished in his own work something which has already been well done by others, which he has never proposed to do, and which, within the limits assigned for his task, would have been impossible!

Passing to particulars, Scherer's division of the whole course of German literary history, by a kind of wave-metaphor, into three great periods, culminating in the years 600, 1200 and 1800, and separated by intervals of deep literary depression, has seemed open to some objection, the movement appearing less regular, while the intervals are relieved by numerous minor crests; and, in this connection, to the 'Song of Hildebrand,' chief remnant of the earlier epoch, is assigned perhaps an undue value. The author's predilection for striking parallelisms and bold contrasts occasionally offends in other respects the conservative or timid mind. Such are the sharp classification of feminine proper names supposed to illustrate distinct epochs in the spiritual development of the nation, the comparison of the vagrant minstrels of the middle ages to wandering journalists, or the likening of Parzival to the Faust of Goethe. The 'Heliand,' Scherer finds rather didactic than epic, in opposition to many admirers of that great Saxon Messiad. Heinrich von Veldeke, he distinguishes chiefly for his merits in introducing pure rime; while, as translator and imitator of French models and methods, he rendered services to his native literature as dubious as those of Opitz six centuries later. It is to great minds like Eschenbach and Vogelweide that Scherer, with a

generous native tendency to praise rather than to blame, pays the meed of cordial appreciation; and the whole Hohenstaufen period is invested in his recital with a glitter of refinement that is made to contrast perhaps too vividly with the decadence of the following centuries.

Careful treatment has been bestowed upon the modern era, which would naturally attract the larger audience, and a sense of true perspective pervades the whole narrative. Opitz fares badly at Scherer's hands, but Luther, Lessing, Herder, Schiller, and especially Goethe, with a host of minor worthies who are briefly but fittingly characterized, are marshalled before us in eloquent language, and the literary features of their times are justly estimated. Want of space forbids a more extended examination of this portion of the work, but we will venture to express the belief, in conclusion, that no literary historian of the later period except Hettner yields such continual suggestion and continual stimulus.

It is faint praise to say, that, through Mrs. Conybeare's rendering, which in itself is generally graceful and idiomatic, the vigorous sententiousness of the original has vanished. It is Pegasus in pound. Never more appropriate than here is the saying: "le style, c'est l'homme." Scherer's effective inversions and bold constructions, which have been censured as the marks of a restless, rhetorical and jerky style, have been solicitously pruned down and shorn of their peculiar, nervous force, and the short, sharp march of the terse sentences has been lengthened into a careless lounge. Not infrequently, the text has been altered by condensations and omissions, which have somewhat impaired the spirit of the passages so treated, or reduced some happy metaphor or apt illustration to a dull commonplace (compare, for instance, vol. I, pp. 26, 27, 199, 272, 274-5; and II: 142, 148-9, 190-1, 202, 228, 245 with the original). The translator has not escaped the usual difficulties of transliteration, the inconsistencies in which, a careful revision would have removed. The reader is not informed what canons of translation have been adopted, nor to what extent Prof. Müller has shared in the work of editing, for neither the English nor the American edition contains a line of explanation by way of preface or intro-

duction. In the London *Athenaeum* for Jan. 23, however, Prof. Müller, in replying to some criticisms on the translation, states that Scherer had given him *carte blanche* to leave out or condense anything considered not of sufficient interest to the English reader, although this right, he states, was sparingly exercised, the omissions being chiefly of passages which might be called patriotic or poetical. Prof. Müller adds, that as regards the translation (which was submitted to Scherer's final approval), he is prepared to vouch for its correctness from beginning to end.

The appendix contains a chronological table of history and literature arranged, as in the original, not in parallel columns, but promiscuously, and fifty pages of invaluable bibliographical notes. With these might have been incorporated, for the benefit of the English reader, a bibliography of works in English on German literature. The index is extensive and circumstantial. The announcement has been made that a general revision of Max Müller's 'German Classics from the Fourth to the Nineteenth Century,' which contains a series of extracts arranged chronologically, with biographical notices of the various authors cited, is soon to be issued as a companion to Mrs. Conybeare's translation. Such a manual will be welcomed by students to whom the standard collections of Müllenhoff and Scherer, of Goedeke and of Wackernagel, are not accessible, and the two works will efficiently supply a distinct want. At present, there is almost nothing in English covering this ground. Metcalfe's history of German literature is merely a readable abridgment of Vilmar, and Gostwick and Harrison's 'Outlines,' a convenient handbook recently revised, would be most useful to a candidate for a civil-service examination. On this side of the water, Taylor's 'Studies in German Literature,' although containing vigorous and subtle criticisms by a master-hand, and revealing the spirit of the literature more clearly and truly than many a treatise of more imposing claims, was intended merely as an introduction to the study of German authors; and Hosmer's 'Short History of German Literature' is rather a series of animated surface sketches of several important epochs and characters than a formal and consecutive narration. The long-heralded history of Prof. E. P. Evans will

find a demand which we trust it will entirely satisfy.

H. S. WHITE.

Cornell University.

La Chanson de Roland.—Nouvelle édition classique, précédée d'une introduction et suivie d'un glossaire, par L. CLÉDAT. Paris, Garnier frères, 1886. 12mo, pp. xxxv + 221.

It is now about fifty years since Francisque Michel for the first time copied the manuscript known as Digby 23, of the Bodleian Library, and published an edition of the 'Chanson de Roland.' Since that time other manuscripts of the poem have been discovered, the worth of the poem itself, both from a philological and from a literary point of view, has been more and more universally recognized, so that today there is no work in the whole early French literature that is so extensively read as this beautiful specimen of feudal poetry. Strange to say, however, we are still without a handy, convenient, cheap edition that can be put in the hands of students. Gautier's editions, in spite of their merits, are marred by a very clumsy translation and by a too liberal use of what may be called the inferior manuscripts of the poem, with a view to remedy the deficiencies of the Oxford Manuscript; Theodor Müller's edition, more sober than Gautier's in the establishment of the text, is neither handy nor cheap and is without either an introduction or a glossary; Eduard Boehmer's edition is cheap and handy, but bad. It was, therefore, with no small pleasure that we read the announcement of a new edition of the 'Chanson de Roland' prepared specially for the use of classes, by Mr. L. Clédat. Although we might perhaps dissent somewhat from the very high estimate of the same writer's *Grammaire élémentaire de l'Ancienne Langue Française*, published in this periodical by Prof. Fortier, it cannot be denied that, after the ground had been cleared by such workers as Müller, Gautier, and also by Gaston Paris (see his introduction to the 'Vie de Saint Alexis'), Mr. Clédat could easily have given us what we had been so long waiting for. Alas! we have examined his edition and been forced to the conclusion that the period of waiting is not yet over.

Cheap the edition is, handy also, and it would be unjust to deny that it has other merits, too. The grammatical introduction is in the main good, save in one respect. Mr. C. speaks of the French language of the eleventh century without any reference to what preceded it. His comparisons are all with Modern French, never with Latin. The consequence is, that the part of the introduction which relates to syntax is both too long and too obscure; instead of trying to give a full enumeration of all the constructions, found in the 'Roland,' which differ from Modern French syntax, it would have been sufficient to refer his readers to the freedom of the Latin construction, not yet given up at the time when the 'Roland' was composed.

The glossary is the best part of the work. Here the references to Latin are nearly as full as could be desired and the words belonging to the same root are so grouped together as to arouse in the students that philological tact which is needed in order to discover a well-known word under the multitudinous forms it assumes in such an ever-changing language as Old French. In one respect, however, the glossary is totally insufficient: Germanic etymologies are not given. Whenever a word of this class is reached, Mr. C. merely says "Germanic origin," without any reference, we do not say to Old High German, but to English or German, both of which are now well studied in French Colleges.

So much for the good features of Mr. C.'s work. The bad part of it is unfortunately the most important. His text is such as very few teachers acquainted with Gautier's and Müller's texts and with that of the Oxford Manuscript will care to put in the hands of students. In his preface, Mr. C. tells us that he rejects the opinion of Gautier and others who consider the 'Roland' as of Norman origin. He is, perhaps, a trifle too emphatic on this point; but he is supported by such authorities as Gaston Paris, Tobler, Förster; he is in too good company for any one to be very hard on him in that respect. But he goes on and announces that he has therefore *francisé* the text of the Oxford Manuscript and that the most important change he has introduced has been "to substitute the letter *o* for the letter *u*, whenever corresponding to a Latin *ö* or *ü*." Had Mr.

Clédat done nothing worse than this he would already be deserving of some censure; but has he done nothing worse?

Let us open the Oxford Manuscript, so well reproduced by Mr. Stengel. The first line runs

Carles li reis nostre emperere magnes.

For this Mr. Clédat gives us

Charles li reis, nostre emperedre maignes.

Both Gautier and Müller had been satisfied to follow the manuscript. What has Mr. C. done? Without paying any attention to the remarkable discussion in which Mr. Gaston Paris has proved that the 'Vie de Saint Alexis' is considerably older (say forty or fifty years) than the 'Roland,' he has reproduced in his edition the French of the 'Vie de Saint Alexis.' Wherever Modern French has substituted *ch* for Latin *c*, he has *ch*; thus, *Carles* becomes *Charles*; *Blancandrins*, *Blanchandrins*; *castel*, *chastel*; *canetz*, *chameitz*; *carres*, *charres*; *chargez*, *chargiez*; *carier*, *charreier*, etc. Whenever the Latin has a *t* or a *d* which has disappeared in Modern French, Mr. C. reinserts it; thus, *emperere* becomes *emperedre*; *frere*, *fredre*; *muers*, *mudiers*; *muëe*, *mudede*, etc. Here is an instance of what is thus accomplished. Line 34 of the MS. is as follows:

Ben en purrat luer ses soldieurs.

Mr. C. gives

Bien en podrat loer ses soldediers.

He goes so far as to admit the form *repaidrier* (for *repairer* or *repairier*), which Mr. Paris considers as having already disappeared at the time when the 'Saint Alexis' was written.

There are other innovations in Mr. C.'s text which call for severe condemnation, especially when remembering that his edition is published for classes still without any philological training and unable to discuss the forms that are brought before them. He introduces mere supposititious forms, without a single word or note informing his readers that he is not merely reproducing the manuscript. Thus whenever the manuscript has *ki est*, *co est*, Mr. Clédat writes *qui'st*, *co'st*, unmindful of the fact that many Romanists contend that the pronunciation should be *k'est*, *c'est*, as it is in modern popular French. Mr. C.'s fondness for suppositions not yet proved is shown even in his

glossary where, for instance, he gives as the etymology of *oil* (*oui*) the form *o il*, proposed by Mr. Tobler, never even mentioning the etymologies *hoc illud* and *hoc illic*.

Before we end this review we must, however, mention one more laudable feature of the work. The poem is interspersed with excellent summaries, pointing out the places where the Oxford MS. is evidently incomplete and stating what must have been expressed by the missing passages. Mr. C. has wisely refrained from borrowing from the other manuscripts of the poem. Had he exhibited as much caution in his transcription of the text of the Oxford MS., his edition would not call forth the severe censure which it is sure to receive from any one in the least conversant with the history and bibliography of the 'Chanson de Roland.'

ADOLPHE COHN.

Harvard University.

A Practical Method of Learning Spanish: in accordance with Ybarra's System of Teaching Modern Languages. By GENERAL ALEJANDRO YBARRA. Published by Ginn & Co., Boston, New York and Chicago, 1885. 12mo, pp. 326.

We have before us a handsome little volume embodying a plan of teaching one to speak and understand the Spanish language without the study of grammar, the author basing his system on the principle that 'a child learns first to speak and understand what is said to him, and then goes to school to learn the reason and the rules of all that he already knows how to say.' The work consists of fifty lessons, each divided into three parts, the first containing 'important words and phrases, idiomatic constructions peculiar to the language, and exercises in the conjugation of the verbs,' all to be learned by heart; the second, a reading exercise with the translation opposite, and the third, 'a practical conversation which ought to be translated from English into Spanish, and from Spanish into English.' At the end of the book are found some 'rules of pronunciation for those who study without a teacher.'

In the consistency with which this plan is carried out as well as in the choice and the arrangement of the material, the author dis-

plays considerable ingenuity and skill. The learner is gradually and in a most interesting way conducted over a wide range of subjects covering the various phases and modes of life, and the reading exercises and dialogues have a freshness about them which, coupled with the real information many of them impart independently of the language itself, raises them far above the level of those usually found in similar works. The English is good throughout and great care has evidently been bestowed upon expression and form. A few remarks, critical and other, which suggested themselves during the perusal of the book, may find their place here.

Page 34. *libreria*, mentioned here besides *biblioteca*, is now antiquated and old-fashioned in the sense of 'library,' its accepted significance being book-store and book-trade. The author employs the word indiscriminately in both senses (cf. pp. 142, 144, 151). The lists of words and phrases to be committed to memory might, for reasons both pedagogical and practical, have been arranged with more regard to the logical connection of their parts and to each other. Without any apparent reason, the very same vocabularies are repeated in a succeeding lesson, and again the learner encounters phrases to be memorized, the meaning of which is clear in the context only. Thus, on p. 35 we have 'wide—narrow' and 'quick—slow,' repeated three pages further on. What is he to make out of such phrases as 'it unites good architecture' (p. 38) and 'that is given by the open air' (p. 43), standing, as they do, apart from their natural connection? p. 48: in *los caballeros con quien hablé*, the form *quien* must be a misprint for *quienes*, since according to the present usage *quien* can only be employed for the singular.—p. 60: *rato* is a misprint for *barato*.—p. 148: To lend interest to the subject, even the pun and the puzzle are laid under contribution. The one on 'right' which we have here, is entirely lost in the Spanish translation, and will hardly be relished by either Englishman or Spaniard as an exercise for the memory.—p. 158: *whoever* you know, is a misprint for *whomever*.—p. 160-162: Here we have a reading exercise on the 'Spanish Language,' the history of which we should have liked to see somewhat more clearly and accurately stated. Among other things the

author tells us (p. 161) that 'The last vestige of Latinity is found in the works of Saint Isidore, of Seville, at the same time that the first literary effort of the new race is the Bible, translated by the Arch(!)bishop Ulphilas.' This is, to say the least, very unfortunately expressed. It is well-known that Vulfila translated the Bible between the years 348-380 in Moesia, long before a Goth set his foot on Spanish ground, and nearly three centuries before the time of Isidore (from about 570-636 A.D.), when with the conversion of their King Reccared (638) the Visigoths began gradually to discontinue the use of their forcible and richly-inflected idiom in favor of that of the adopted religion.—p. 171: *las travias* is a misprint for *los t.*—p. 173: 'Me ocuparé de arreglar todo lo demás.' Though *ocuparse de*, meaning 'to busy one's self with,' occurs here and there, the best usage we think still favors the more idiomatic construction *ocuparse en*. Vincent Salvá, for instance, in his Gramática castellana, p. 299, censures Quintana for using *de* instead of *en* and condemns it as a gallicism.—p. 243: The etymologies here given of some of the names of countries are in part rather fanciful. Thus *Holland* is derived, according to the current popular etymology, from the German words *hohl* and *land* signifying 'deep-land,' whereas it means 'woodland,' from *Holtland* (Germ. *holz*, Engl. *holt*) as it was written down to about the eleventh century (cf. *Holtstein* and similar names). Lessons 42-46 give us in the first part a number of Spanish idioms and proverbs with their English equivalents. The value of this collection would have been considerably enhanced, and the task of memorizing it made much less arduous, if, instead of enumerating these phrases without any apparent order, the author had grouped together those containing the same or a similar idea.

Page 254: 'paso de buey.' Also '*paso de gallo.*' En cada siglo suele adelantar el *paso de un gallo*, si no retrocede. E. Castelar, Sant. el Pos. c. 4.—'A sus anchas,' needlessly repeated p. 269.—'A tuertas y á derechas,' cf. synon. 'por fas ó por nefas,' p. 276.—'Allá se las haya,' cf. synon. 'con su pan se lo coma,' p. 260.—p. 255: To 'apretar los talones' belong the synonymous phrases 'mostrar la suela de los zapatos,' p. 271, and 'poner piés en

polvorosa,' p. 276. To 'azotar el aire' add 'dar música á un sordo,' and 'echar agua en el mar,' p. 260, also 'sembrar en arena,' 'arar en el mar,' p. 285.—p. 260: To 'Darse á la vela' belongs 'hacerse á la vela,' p. 270.—p. 261: To 'de buenas á primeras' cf. 'sin decir esta boca es mia;' to *de intento* add *adrede*, which like *asaz*, *empero* and other obsolete expressions has been revived by modern writers. (P. A. de Alarcon, La Alpujarra, p. 4; R. J. Cuervo, Romania, XII, 109). To 'dejar en el tintero' cf. 'quedar entre renglones.'—To *send* coals to Newcastle is not English; it must be *carry*, as the pith of the saying lies in the labor of carrying coals where they are not needed. (cf. the German: *Eulen nach Athen tragen*). This idiom ought to have been mentioned under 'azotar el aire,' p. 255.—p. 266: 'En un cerrar y abrir de ojos' is commonly quoted with the opposite order of the verbs (see, for instance, Dicc. de la Ac., or Alarcon, La Alpujarra, p. 304). To 'encomendar las ovejas al lobo' belongs 'poner el lobo en el corral,' p. 276.—p. 269: In 'Estar hecho en fuego' *en* is misprint for *un*.—To 'hacer de un camino dos mandados' compare 'de una pedrada matar dos pájaros' (Fern. Cab. Clemencia, II, 18), most probably a direct translation from the English.—p. 270: To 'hacer de la vista gorda' add 'tener ó ser de manga ancha.' 'Levantar á uno sobre los cuernos de la luna' is repeated p. 285; to 'más blando que una breva' compare 'suave como un guante' Fern. Cab. Familia de Alvareda, I, c. 7).—p. 273: 'A buena gana no hay pan duro.' The English expression of this idea occurs also in Spanish: La mejor salsa del mundo es la hambre (D. Q. II, 5). 'A moedad ociosa vejez trabajosa' belongs together with 'El perezoso siempre está menesteroso,' p. 283, and 'á muertos y á idos no hay amigos' with 'ojos que no ven, corazón que no siente,' p. 294.—p. 274: 'al buen entendedor con media palabra basta.' The usual version of this proverb is: 'al buen entendedor pocas palabras,' or 'a buen entendedor breve hablador. To 'al fin se canta la gloria' and the following 'al freir será el reir' belongs 'nadie se alabe hasta que acabe,' p. 293.—p. 275: To 'bienes mal adquiridos,' etc., add 'lo ageno no hace heredero,' p. 292.—p. 276: 'To be without resources' is repeated on the same

page.—p. 282: To ‘cuando te diéren el anillo pon el dedillo’ cf. ‘la ocasión perdida no se recobra facilmente,’ p. 292.—Add to ‘de la mano á la boca desaparece (*se pierde*) la sopa,’ the proverb mentioned further down on the same page ‘del dicho al hecho hay mucho trecho.’ But *mucho* is a mistake for *gran*; see for example D. Q. II, 34 and the dictionaries and cf. the Italian ‘del detto al fatto c’è *gran* tratto.’ So also in Old Spanish:

Mas como es grant salto poral cielo sobr
Tan grant ribazo aze entre fazer e dezir.

Alex. 2301.—p. 285: The current English equivalent for ‘tea de discordia’ is not ‘torch of discord,’ but ‘brand’ or more commonly ‘apple of discord.’ (So also Spanish: manzana de discordia).—p. 291: Under ‘hacerlo mal, excusarlo peor’ should be mentioned ‘pecado confesado medio perdonado.’—p. 292, To ‘necesidad carece de ley’ compare the characteristic idiom: ‘la necesidad tiene cara de hereje.’ (Luis Gongora y Argote, Letrillas)—p. 293: To ‘más vale pájaro en mano que ciento volando’ belongs ‘más vale un toma que dos te daré’ cited further down on the same page, and ‘muchas candelillas hacen un cirio pascual’ is synonymous to ‘el que hace un cesto hace un ciento,’ p. 294; cf. to this ‘muchos pocos hacen un mucho,’ D. Q. II, 7.—p. 294: ‘puerco fiado gruñe todo el año’ renders the idea of the English, ‘he that goes a borrowing, goes a sorrowing’ more faithfully than ‘pan ageno caro cuesta.’

The last four lessons are composed of exercises in the language of commerce, which no doubt will prove of great assistance to the man of business, and the book closes with ‘rules of pronunciation (Spanish and English) for those who study without a teacher.’ For obvious reasons we may confine our remarks to the treatment of Spanish pronunciation. These rules, we regret to say, will, partly from inaccuracy, partly from insufficiency, not aid the self-taught to form even an approximately correct idea of Spanish sounds, nay, they must, from the stand-point of modern phonetics at least, be called useless and only confusing even for those who enjoy the guidance of a teacher.

The vowels are disposed of in a few lines stating their names and their most general

sound, *y* not being admitted into the list. Nothing is said of the difference between the open and close *e* and *v*; as, for instance, in *temer* and *temo*, *verde*, and *orden*, *Córdoba*; nothing, of the important fact that Spanish vowels are not slurred over as it is done in English in syllables not having the primary accent. Imagine the pronunciation of such a word as *desasosegadamente*!

The diphthongs are totally ignored: How could the learner picture to himself the sound of such words as *quisiéreis*, *almohadilla*, or *ayer*?

The consonants fare little better. Of *b* and *v*, whose sound-value is practically the same (cf. their common interchanging and also their passing over into *g* in the speech of the lower classes) it is said that they are the same as in English. The regular voiced lip-stop *b* is found only after *m*.—The breath-stops *p t c* are pure tenues (with Sievers’ *leisen* absatz), not pronounced, as in English, with a forcible emission of breath, initially, before or, finally, after an accented vowel. (Sievers’ *aspirirter* absatz): *d* shares far more the character of a continuant than of a stop, hence its suppression between vowels and its transition to voiced *s* or almost total disappearance at the end of words. Again, *s* is not the same as in English, for that would, among other things, imply that it may be voiced between vowels; as, for instance, in English and French (cf. *wise*, *rose*, *phrase*). See the interesting notes on the pronunciation of this sound in Storm, *Englische Philologie*, I, 28, 29, 100, 426.—‘*y*(ee griega),’ we are informed, “is pronounced as in the English word *young*. It is sometimes used as a vowel, in which case it is pronounced like *ll*.” As the latter is said to have ‘a liquid sound like that of *ll* in the words *brilliant* and *William*,’ the learner is left to conclude that the conjunction *y*, for instance, has the sound of *lli* in *brilliant*! But enough. What avails it to teach the practical use of a language by the most practical method, if the learner is led to acquire habits of pronunciation which can only prevent him from speaking it intelligibly himself and understanding it when spoken by others, and which he will find it almost impossible to correct in any satisfactory degree!

I have no doubt that, under an enthusiastic and original teacher like Mr. Ybarra, those

who are in favor of a practical method of this kind, and willing to conform to its peculiar demands, may by the use of this book acquire a desirable facility in reading and probably, in some measure, even in speaking the language. But masters in the art of teaching are not likely to bind themselves by the subjects and form of conversation prescribed in this and similar manuals, while in the hands of the mechanical teacher dialogues the most animated, topics the most suggestive are commonly reduced to the hackneyed tunes of the street-organ. On the other hand, it is not believed that the study of this Practical Method, whether carried on with or without the aid of a teacher, will assist the beginner in acquiring anything like a mastery of the rudiments of the Spanish language, and this for the following reasons: In the work before us, as in all similar ones that we know, the material to be memorized is composed of a variety of disconnected and, apart from the context, often meaningless vocables and phrases which, so far from furnishing the student with a readily available stock of words, overburden the memory and make him dependent on a larger or smaller number of undigested, because mechanically learned, phrases, the real import and proper use of which he can hardly know. Again, here as in like books, the most indispensable elements of grammar, say the verbs, are promiscuously scattered all over the ground, so that even the more attentive will fail to get a full survey and mastery of conjugation. The student is not enabled to use his own judgment in the formation of tenses; he is, especially when learning by himself, not fitted to build sentences beyond the small number he has committed to memory. The almost inevitable result of all this would seem to be that, though able to utter many a useful phrase glibly enough, he will, when brought face to face with a native, in nine cases out of ten be called upon to speak on subjects for which none of his memorized vocables and idioms can answer, and be at a loss how to express an idea of his own. In short, the 'practical method,' such as it is, is destructive of its own ends. I am inclined to think that a far more accurate and practical knowledge of modern languages can be acquired by a thorough study of and drill in the essentials of grammar, the articles, the formation of the

plural of nouns, the adjective, the pronoun and especially the verb, to go hand in hand with careful and well-graded exercises in reading. In a course like this, I should think, Mr. Ybarra's Practical Method would render excellent service as a reader and a help for practice in conversation.

HENRY R. LANG.

Charleston, S. C.

PERSONAL.

Mr. George Hempl, Instructor in German at the Johns Hopkins University, has nearly ready for the press *A Beginner's Book in German*.

Mr. Hempl is about to sail for Europe where, for the coming two years, he intends to pursue special studies in English and German Philology.

Mr. A. H. Symth, a special student of English and German at the Johns Hopkins University, recently won in competitive examination the chair of English literature in the Philadelphia Boys' High School, and has, upon special request, at once entered upon the duties of his new position.

Dr. Julius Goebel discusses the "copyright-question" in a contribution to Prof. Kürschner's "Deutsche Schriftstellerzeitung" of March 1st. The 'Nation' of April 29th, commenting on the article at length, recommends it to German readers in the United States for thoughtful perusal.

OBITUARY.

Julius Schmidt, the celebrated historian of German literature, died suddenly on the 27th of March. He was born at Marienwerder in 1818, became an instructor at a Realschule in Berlin and afterwards edited, with Gustav Freytag, "Die Graenzboten." He was just publishing a new edition of the great work of his life: 'Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von Leibnitz bis auf unsere Zeit' when he was called away, fortunately leaving, however, the whole manuscript finished. This new edition is a great improvement upon the former ones, as it has taken the form of an historical narrative instead of being a collection of extracts accompanied by the author's remarks. Julian Schmidt's chief importance was that of a critic and as such he has had a great influence upon the development of modern German Literature.